<u>REMARKS</u>

In accordance with the foregoing, claim 10 has been amended to correct a clear typo, and claims 1-48 are pending and under consideration. No new matter is presented in this Amendment.

REJECTIONS UNDER DOUBLE PATENTING:

Claims 1-48 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory double patenting over claims 1-53 of U.S. Patent 7,200,683. However, it appears that the '683 patent is clearly distinguishable from the present claims. In particular, claim 1 of the '683 patent does not recite a buffer allocation, and there is insufficient evidence that the use of buffer allocation is an obvious variation claim 1 of the '683 patent. Additionally, since claims 1-48 of the instant application have not yet been indicated as allowable, it is believed that any submission of a Terminal Disclaimer or arguments as to the non-obvious nature of the claims would be premature. As such, it is respectfully requested that Applicants be allowed to address any nonstatutory double patenting issues remaining once the rejections of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102 are resolved.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102:

Claims 1-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Tsumagari et al. (U.S. Publication 2003/0161615), hereinafter "Tsumagari." The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection and request reconsideration.

Regarding the rejection of independent claim 1, it is noted that claim 1 recites, "[A]llocating at least a portion of the ENAV buffer to be an updateable markup area provided for ENAV files on the basis of ENAV buffer configuration information." In contrast, Tsumagari only discloses an ENAV Buffer (paragaphs [0395] to [0397]) managed by a Buffer Manager that controls a loading and discarding of ENAV content to/from the ENAV Buffer (paragraph [0421]). Though the ENAV Buffer includes an ENAV-Unit Buffer, a Synchronized Audio Buffer, and a Font Buffer (paragraph [0395], Tsumagari does not teach an allocating of at least a portion of the ENAV buffer, let alone an allocating on the basis of ENAV buffer configuration information, as recited in claim 1. The Examiner cites paragraphs [0072] to [0073], [0183], and [0393] of Tsumagari for a teaching of such an allocation according to ENAV buffer configuration

information. However, paragraphs [0072] to [0073] regard an allocating of ENAV playback information on a DVD-Video disc (paragraph [0071]), and not an allocating of an area of a buffer. Also, paragraph [0183] refers to the display of a DVD-Video/ENAV mixed menu on a portion of a display area. Furthermore, paragraph [0393] relates to the Buffer Manager from which ENAV content is loaded or discarded, as described above. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully submit that Tsumagari fails to disclose, implicitly or explicitly, an allocating of at least a portion of an ENAV buffer on the basis of ENAV buffer configuration information, as recited in claim 1.

Regarding the rejection of claim 2, it is noted that this claim depends from claim 1 and is, therefore, allowable for at least the reasons set forth above. Furthermore, it is noted that claim 2 recites, "[A]llocating the updateable markup area according to memory size information included in the ENAV buffer configuration file." In contrast, Tsumagari does not teach an allocating of a buffer or an ENAV buffer configuration file, let alone an allocating according to memory size information. The Examiner cites paragraph [0397] for such an allocating according to memory size information. However, paragraph [0397] relates to seamless playback of a DVD-Video using "name/location/size/content type of ENAV elements," rather than an allocating according to memory size information, as recited in claim 2.

Regarding the rejection of claim 3, it is noted that this claim depends from claim 1 and is, therefore, allowable for at least the reasons set forth above. Furthermore, it is noted that claim 3 recites, "[A]llocating the updateable markup area according to memory names and sizes information included in the ENAV buffer configuration file." In contrast, Tsumagari does not teach an allocating of a buffer or an ENAV buffer configuration file, let alone an allocating according to memory names and sizes information. The Examiner cites paragraph [0397] for such an allocating according to memory names and sizes information. However, paragraph [0397] relates to seamless playback of a DVD-Video using "name/location/size/content type of ENAV elements," rather than an allocating according to memory names and sizes information, as recited in claim 3.

Regarding the rejection of claims 4-9, it is noted that these claims depend from claim 1 and are, therefore, allowable for at least the reasons set forth above.

Regarding the rejection of claim 10, it is noted that this claim depends from claim 1 and is, therefore, allowable for at least the reasons set forth above. Furthermore, it is noted that claim 10 recites, "[D]isplaying an error message..." In contrast, though Tsumagari discloses an

error that may occur and a transition rule if such an error occurs (paragraphs [0360] to [0361]), Tsumagari does not disclose, implicitly or explicitly, an outputting of an error message, as recited in claim 10.

Regarding the rejection of claim 11, the Applicants respectfully submit that this claim is allowable for at least the reasons set forth with regards to claim 1.

Regarding the rejection of claim 12, the Applicants respectfully submit that this claim is allowable for at least the reasons set forth with regards to claim 2.

Regarding the rejection of claim 13, the Applicants respectfully submit that this claim is allowable for at least the reasons set forth with regards to claim 3.

Regarding the rejection of claims 14-19, it is noted that these claims depend from claim 11 and are, therefore, allowable for at least the reasons set forth above.

Regarding the rejection of claims 20-23, it is noted that these claims depend from claim 1 and are, therefore, allowable for at least the reasons set forth above.

Regarding the rejection of claim 24, the Applicants respectfully submit that this claim is allowable for at least the reasons set forth with regards to claim 1. In particular, the Applicants note that Tsumagari does not disclose, implicitly or explicitly, an allocating of a buffer, or a loading of an interactive file according to a type of the interactive file, as recited in claim 24. The Examiner cites paragraph [0432] for a teaching of such a conditional loading of an interactive file. However, paragraph [0432] relates to the updating of status information (i.e., the replacing of old status information with new status information), and not the loading of an interactive file, as recited in claim 24.

Regarding the rejection of claims 25-48, it is noted that these claims depend from claim 24 and are, therefore, allowable for at least the reasons set forth above. Furthermore, the Applicants note that Tsumagari does not implicitly or explicitly disclose the following features not addressed by the Examiner: a determining of a size of the updateable markup area using information read from a storage medium (i.e., DVD-Video in Tsumagari), as recited in claims 25-31; a chat service, as recited in claims 38 and 41; an internet service, as recited in claims 39 and 42; and a loading of interactive files according to a detected order, as recited in claim 40.

CONCLUSION:

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 503333.

Respectfully submitted,

STEIN, MCEWEN & BUI, LLP

Date: 7/1/08

Fadi N. Kiblawi

Registration No. 61,973

1400 Eye St., NW Suite 300

Washington, D.C. 20005 Telephone: (202) 216-9505 Facsimile: (202) 216-9510